



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/134,405	08/14/98	HAM	Y 8733D-6833

LOEB & LOEB
10100 SANTA MONICA BOULEVARD
SUITE 2200
LOS ANGELES CA 90067-4164

MM22/0624

EXAMINER

DUONG, T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2871

DATE MAILED: 06/24/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/134,405

Applicant(s)

HAM

Examiner

T. DUONG

Group Art Unit

2871

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Response

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a response be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 111; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- ☐ Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☒ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 4
- ☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2871

The drawings are objected to since Figs. 1A-B should be labeled as "Prior Art" as disclosed as such in the specification.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 8, 12-14 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Prior Art Disclosure.

Applicant's Prior Art Disclosure discloses on pages 2-4 of the specification a LCD device similar to that of the instant claims except for $d_{\Delta n}$ being in the range of $0.21\mu\text{m} - 0.36\mu\text{m}$ (p.4, lines 23-26), as compared to the claimed range of $0.29 - 0.36\mu\text{m}$. Thus, the claimed range lies inside the range disclosed by the prior art. However, it has been held that in the case where the claimed ranges "overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art" a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists. *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976); *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed.Cir. 1990). See MPEP 2144.05.

Claims 4-7, 9-11, 15-18 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Prior Art Disclosure as applied to claims 1-3, 8, 12-14 and 19 above, and further in view of Yanagawa et al'160 and Kang et al'669. Claims 4-7, 9-11, 15-18 and 20-22 recite materials used as the passivation layer and the alignment layer. However, these

Application/Control Number: 09/134,405

Page 3

Art Unit: 2871

materials are well-known in the art for the same intended purposes, as evidenced by Yanagawa (Fig. 15H) and Kang (cols.1-2).

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Tai Duong at telephone number (703) 308-4873.


TVD

June 21, 1999

